

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the first and second paragraphs. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

After the above amendment in claim 1, the amended claim 1 as well as its depending claims particularly point out that the first finger has closer lateral distance (D1) to the guard ring 31 than that of the second finger (D2) as shown in Fig. 5. Thus, the claimed limitations are clear and can be understood by those skilled in the art. Claims 1-3 are considered patentable.

Claims 1-3, insofar as in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (US Patent No. 6,455,898) or Hsu et al. (US Patent No. 6,057,579) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As per claim 1, the Examiner notes that Liu et al. and Hsu et al. teach a MOS transistor array formed in a region and comprising a first MOS transistor and a second MOS transistor, wherein the first finger width is smaller than said second finger width. However, what they actually teach is the channel length of the finger, not the finger width in this application. With reference to Fig. 5 in this application, the first finger width is  $W_{f1}$  and the second finger width is  $W_{f2}$ . Neither Liu et al. nor Hsu et al. teach this claimed subject matter. It is therefore submitted that the cited art's teachings are different from what is claimed in claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the claim 1 as a whole in order to properly interpret the meaning of the claim terms.

As independent claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Liu et al. and Hsu et al. for the reasons set forth above, claims 2 and 3 depending from claim 1 are also considered patentable for the same reasons.

A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6903. If any other fees are due in Attorney Docket No. JLINP093.DIV2

Appl. No. 10/749,972  
Armdt. dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 14, 2004

**PATENT**

connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No JLINP093.DIV2). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
**MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP**

  
Albert S. Penilla, Esq.  
Reg. No. 39,487

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901